## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	☐ Force	☑ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
Takeya Patterson		Team # 3	201016751	☐ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Tuesday, 12/07/2010 9:45 PM		inside the 46th Precinct stationhouse		46	6/7/2012	6/7/2012
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	Date/Time	Date/Time Received at CCRB	
Tue, 12/07/2010 10:21 PM		CCRB	Call Processing System	Tue, 12/07	Tue, 12/07/2010 10:21 PM	
Complainant/Victim	Туре	Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Kevin Martin	24921	941068	046 PCT			
Officer(s)	Allegation	Allegation		Investigator Recommendation		
A.POM Kevin Martin	Discourtesy: Police Officer Kevin Martin spoke obscenely towards § 87(2)(b)					

## **Case Summary**

On December 7, 2010, \$87(2)(b) contacted the Civilian Complaint Review
Board (CCRB) via its call processing system and filed the following complaint.
On December 7, 2010, at approximately 8:30pm, §87(2)(b) received a call from
PO Kevin Martin, of the 46th Precinct, who was identified through the name and shield number he
provided her. PO Martin stated that \$87(2)(b) s \$87(2)(b) brother, \$87(2)(b) was
arrested for possession of marijuana and needed to be picked up from the 46th Precinct.
When § 87(2)(b) and her mother arrived at the precinct at approximately 9:45pm, PO
Martin said \$87(2)(b) would be released in 5 minutes. Twenty minutes later, \$87(2)(b)
inquired to PO Martin about the extended wait period. PO Martin responded that she was the
reason he was held up because she was asking questions. Approximately 10 minutes later, PO
Martin approached \$87(2)(b) with paper work in his hand and asked for her mother. \$87(2)(b)
responded by informing him that she could handle the paperwork. PO Martin then instructed
to lower her tone and stated that he did not like her tone of voice. §87(2)(b) told him that
her tone was moderate. PO Martin then asked for \$87(2)(b) s mother and stated, "I don't have to
release him". He walked away and spoke to \$87(2)(b) s mother. After \$87(2)(b) was released,
asked for PO Martin's badge number. When he provided it, he repeated it over very
slowly as to indicate that \$87(2)(6) could not comprehend what he was saying. After leaving the
precinct, \$87(2)(6) informed \$87(2)(6) that PO Martin referred to him as a "douchebag", and
stated profanity in front of him (Allegation A).
PO Martin was identified by \$87(2)(b) through the name and shield number he provided
her. PO Martin was described as a 5'10" tall white male, approximately in his mid-thirties with
dark brown hair, § 87(2)(b)
dark brown hair, \$87(2)(b)  The Automated Roll Call System (ARCS) confirms that PO
. The Automated Roll Call System (ARCS) confirms that PO
. The Automated Roll Call System (ARCS) confirms that PO Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made
. The Automated Roll Call System (ARCS) confirms that PO Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$87(2)(6) and \$87(2)(6) via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they
. The Automated Roll Call System (ARCS) confirms that PO Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$87(2)(6) and \$87(2)(6) and \$87(2)(6) are via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$87(2)(6) was contacted via telephone and provided
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010}\$ wis telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010}\$ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010}\$ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother.
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) was contacted via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$87(2)(b) was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$87(2)(b) indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. \$100 did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{887(2)(6)}{2010}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2010}\$ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2010}\$ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2010}\$ did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2010}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{201
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{887(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ and \$\frac{887(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{897(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ contact the CCRB and one message was left with \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{87(2)(b)}\$
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that and \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ and \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ contact the CCRB and one message was left with \$\frac{87(2)(6)}{2}\$ and \$\fr
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ contact the CCRB and one message was left with }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\fra
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$87(2)(b) was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$87(2)(b) indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that and \$87(2)(b) are called the undersigned investigator and left a voice message. An additional call was made to each provided number and a message was left with \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) are returned the
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that \$\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ contact the CCRB and one message was left with }\frac{87(2)(b)}{2010} \text{ and }\fra
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) via telephone and two letters were sent requesting that they contact the CCRB. On December 14, 2010, \$87(2)(b) was contacted via telephone and provided details of this complaint. At the conclusion of the conversation, \$87(2)(b) indicated she would call back by December 15, 2010, to schedule an appointment for herself and her brother. did not contact the undersigned investigator to schedule her appointment. Since that date three additional calls were made. Two messages were left via voicemail machine requesting that and \$87(2)(b) are called the undersigned investigator and left a voice message. An additional call was made to each provided number and a message was left with \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) are returned the
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\strace{\strac
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\strace{\strac
Martin was on duty during the date and time of incident.  Between the dates of December 9, 2010 and December 21, 2010, six attempts were made to contact \$\strace{\strac

Team:		:
Investigator:		
Signature	Print	Date
Supervisor:		
Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:		
Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:		
Title/Signature	Print	Date